UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,295	01/15/2004	Masami Kashiwazaki	CANO:114	5169

37013   7590   03/17/2008
ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP.
P.O. BOX 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER
ZHU, RICHARD Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/758,295	KASHIWAZAKI, MASAMI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard Z. Zhu	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5 and 8-14* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5 and 8-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
             application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

    1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible

    for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

    has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn

    pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/17/2008 has been

    entered.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments had been duly considered, however, they are not persuasive for at

    least the following reasons:

    With respect to the applicant's disagreement with the combination set forth by the

    examiner, it is the examiner's belief that the prevalent use of email as means for electronic

    communication over a network is so well known that one of ordinary skill in the art would be

    motivated to use it as means for communication information between a server and a client.

    To one of ordinary skill in the art with the technical know-how of late 20th century,

    implementing means for communicating information on a network as taught by *Hussey*

    would've been notoriously well known for its efficiency and user compatibility. Even for

    argument's sake, *Ramsay* and *Hussey* both discloses searching and querying a server from a

client over a network thereby making the references analogous functionally and structurally in all respect. As such, the examiner believed that the combinations are proper.

Ramsay discloses a storage and retrieval system for communicating actual images and documents between servers and clients over a network where the actual searched images or documents are being communicated.

Hussey discloses a storage and retrieval system for communicating search results not necessarily limited to actual images and documents between servers and clients over a network where the search results are being communicated over a network in email format.

In addition to the old references presented, the examiner set forth a new reference *Guha (US 6539373 B1)* which discloses that it is very well known in the art of database query to have search results that only indicate location of the files being searched instead of sending the entire file being search.

With respect to the applicant's argument directed toward *Hussey*, *Hussey* clearly suggested applicant's claimed limitation in Col 9, Rows 8-11, "Of course, a wide variety of filters and resulting specialized processing of email SQL requests designating the filters is possible and is generally only limited by the processing capabilities of the SQL server 22". So the question becomes "Would've been within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enter a filter that retrieve only the file location of the file being queried instead of retrieving the entire file? " and "Would it be within the processing capabilities of SQL server 22 to retrieve only the file location of the file being queried if a user enter such a SQL request?" The examiner believes that it is well within the knowledge

of one of ordinary skill in the art to orchestrate such request viewing in light of **_Guha_ (Col 1-2)** and that it is well within the processing capabilities of SQL server 22 to do so viewing in light of the teachings of **_Hussey_ (If the processor can send the search results in the form of Excel or text, then processor certainly has the capacity not to send it at all).**

As such, rejections made under **_Ramsay_** and **_Hussey_** in view of **_Lin_** are withdrawn and new grounds of rejections under **_Ramsay_** and **_Hussey_** in view of **_Guha_** are made for this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **_Ramsay et al. (US 5502576 A)_** in view of **_Hussey (US 5826269 A)_** and **_Guha (US 6539373 B1)_**.

Regarding Claims 1, 11 and 12, **_Ramsay_** discloses a document management system comprising:

a host computer (**Figure 1, Terminal 14. Col 25, Rows 35-36**);

an image information processing apparatus (**Col 25-26, see specifics below**);

a document management server that manages electronic document data (**Fig 1, Electronic Image Server 30 + Mass Storage 34. Col 26, Rows 20-30**);

and a network that connects said host computer (**Fig 1, Network 12 and High Speed**

Network 28. Col 25, Rows 38-44), said image information processing apparatus, and said

document management server to each other (**Col 25, Rows 64 - Col 26, Row 4**);

and wherein said image information processing apparatus comprises:

an image information reading device that reads image information (**Col 25, Rows 40-**

42. Fig 1, Digital Capture 18 and Analog Capture 32);

a searching device that searches the electronic document data within said document

management server for an original electronic document data file corresponding to the read

image information (**Col 26, Rows 37 - 41. Fig 1, Mainframe 16 and Mass Storage 34. It**

appears that the user manually search the database);

and a notifying device that notifies or transmits a result of search by said searching

device (**Col 26, Rows 41 - 49. Process of notification is achieved when Terminal 14**

receives the image documents from Mass Storage 34, per user's request).

Ramsay does not disclose a setting device and the notifying device which

communicates with the user via email, attaching the search results to the email, and search

information indicative of the locations of the search results within the database.

Hussey discloses:

a setting device (**Fig 1, Email Processor 32**) that sets, based on a user operation (**Col**

8, Rows 47 – Col 9, Row 20, the Email Processor apply the filtering criteria in

accordance to user demand, Col 9, Rows 14-18), whether or not the searched original

electronic document data is attached to an electronic mail (**Col 7, Rows 21-37. If the**

corresponding file is located, it is attached and sent to the user. Else, no attachment will

be set in the electronic mail. **Furthermore, it is well within the knowledge of one of**

ordinary skill in the art to orchestrate a SQL request that exclude the actual file being

searched to be attached to the email); and

a notifying device (**Fig 1, Email Processor 32**) that transmits a result of search by

said searching device as an electronic mail (**Col 7, Rows 21-37**) to an electronic mail address

(**Fig 3, and see Col 8, Rows 16-30, sender field where the request is originated**),

wherein the searched original electronic document data file is attached to the

electronic mail to be transmitted file by said notifying device when said setting device sets

that the searched original electronic document data file is to be attached (**Col 7, Rows 21-37,**

if the corresponding document is found, the setting device attach said document to the

electronic mail and send it to the requester as part of the electronic response), and

wherein no file corresponding to the searched original electronic document data file is

attached to the electronic mail to be transmitted by said notifying device when said setting

device sets that the searched original electronic document data file is not to be attached (**Col**

9, Rows 8-20, it is well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to

orchestrate a SQL request that exclude the actual file being searched to be attached to

the email).

Ramsay and *Hussey* are in the same field of server that stores and retrieves images

and/or documents.

It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to incorporate the electronic mail processor of *Hussey* into *Ramsay* so that the client who

made the request can be properly notified of the results of search whereas the motivation

would've been to provide "a networked system for processing queries for a server in a distributed processing environment" (***Hussey,*** **Abstract**).

Hussey does not disclose the result of search including information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored.

Guha disclose the result of search including information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored (**Col 1 - Col 2, the background section demonstrated that it is notoriously well known to have a search technique that retrieved only location of the file being searched**).

Lin is in the same field of database management and retrieval of images and/or document as ***Ramsay*** and ***Hussey***.

It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include filename, information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored, as part of or the entirety of the search result whereas the motivation would've been to allow the user to browsed efficiently and retrieve requested document and/or images quickly (***Guha,*** **Col 1, Rows 23-25, "rapidly identify whether or not a particular item exists"**).

Regarding Claim 5, *Ramsay* discloses wherein said image information processing apparatus comprises an operating section, and said notifying device displays the result of search in said operating section (**Column 25, Rows 49 through 50, the computers 14 has raster display or LCD projection screens. Column 26, Rows 49 through 50, the operator may process the retrieved image as desired**).

Regarding Claim 9, *Ramsay* discloses wherein said image information processing apparatus further comprises:

a printing device (**Column 25, Row 43**); and

a controller operable when the original electronic document data file corresponding to the read image information is present within said document management server (**Column 26, Rows 44 through 49**), to cause said printing device to print the original electronic document data file (**Column 26, Rows 49 through 50. The operator, in this case, is the one to issue commands to the system and dictates its method of processing the retrieved image document. Therefore, the operator serves as the controller**).

Regarding Claim 10, *Ramsay* discloses wherein said image information processing apparatus comprises:

a storage device (**Column 25, Rows 64 through 67, mass storage device 34**); and

a controller operable when the original electronic document data file corresponding to the electronic document data within the read image information is present within said document management server, to provide control to store data obtained by rendering the original electronic document data in said storage device (**Column 26, Row 55 through Column 27, Row 8**).

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Ramsay et al. (US 5502576 A)* in view of *Hussey (US 5826269 A)* and *Guha (US 6539373 B1)* and further in view of *Langseth et al. (US 6694316 B1)*.

    Ramsay discloses wherein the user operation is executed via an external computer (**Fig 1, Terminal 14**) that is connected via the network to the image information processing apparatus (**Fig 1, Digital Capture 18, Analog Capture 32, Output 20**).

    Ramsay does not disclose it is done via a web browser.

    Langseth discloses an interface to a server via a web browser (**Col 13, Rows 10-56 specifically Rows 48-56**).

    Langseth, like the rest of the references applied, is in the field of database.

    It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the interface of *Ramsay* with a web browser of *Langseth* whereas the motivation would've been to provide the user with a graphical interface in which the user can use to control the communication and execute tasks between the terminal device and the server.

6.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Hussey (US 5826269*

A) in view of *Abdel-Mottaleb et al (US 6285995 B1)* and *Guha (US 6539373 B1)*.

Regarding Claim 14, *Hussey* discloses a network system whereas a client is

connected to a server that manages document data via a network (**Abstract**):

a setting unit (**Fig 1, Email Processor 32**) that sets, based on a user operation (**Col 8,**

Rows 47 – Col 9, Row 20, the Email Processor apply the filtering criteria in accordance

to user demand, Col 9, Rows 14-18), whether or not the searched original electronic

document data file is to be attached to an electronic mail (**Col 7, Rows 21-37. If the**

corresponding file is located, it is attached and sent to the user. Else, no attachment will

be set in the electronic mail); and

a transmitting unit (**Fig 1, Email Processor 32**) that transmits a result of search by

said searching device as an electronic mail (**Col 7, Rows 21-37**) to an electronic mail address

(**Fig 3, and see Col 8, Rows 16-30, sender field where the request is originated**),

wherein the searched original electronic document data file is attached to the

electronic mail to be transmitted file by said notifying device when said setting device sets

that the searched original electronic document data file is to be attached (**Col 7, Rows 21-37,**

if the corresponding document is found, the setting device attach said document to the

electronic mail and send it to the requester as part of the electronic response), and

wherein no file corresponding to the searched original electronic document data file is

attached to the electronic mail to be transmitted by said notifying device when said setting

device sets that the searched original electronic document data file is not to be attached (**Col**

9, Rows 8-20, it is well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to

orchestrate a SQL request that exclude the actual file being searched to be attached to

the email).

      Hussey does not disclose image information processing apparatus and the searching

unit.

      Abdel-Mottaleb discloses an image information processing apparatus (**Fig 1, System**

100 and see Entry Unit 122, Col 5, Rows 39-41, a scanning device) connected to a

document management database (**Fig 1, Database 102 and see Col 5, Rows 12-15, database**

of images) that manages electronic document data, the image information processing

apparatus comprises:

      a searching unit (**Fig 1, Comparison Unit 128**) that searches (**Col 5, Rows 45-54,**

the Comparison unit compares the query image with image in the database using

feature vector) the electronic document data within said document management database for

original electronic document data corresponding to image information read by an reading

unit (**Fig 1, query image by Entry Unit 122**);

Abdel-Mottaleb and *Hussey* are in the same field of database that stores and retrieves images

and/or documents.

      It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to incorporate the search unit and the image processing apparatus of *Abdel-Mottaleb* into

Hussey so that the client can enter an query image and search for the appropriate

corresponding image in the database via network connection whereas the motivation

would've been to provide "an image retrieval system of the kind set forth in which the time for finding candidate images similar with the query image is reduced" (***Abdel-Mottaleb,* Col 1, Rows 66 – Col 2, Rows 3**).

   Hussey does not disclose the result of search including information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored.

   Guha disclose the result of search including information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored (**Col 1 - Col 2, the background section demonstrated that it is notoriously well known to have a search technique that retrieved only location of the file being searched**).

Lin is in the same field of database management and retrieval of images and/or document as *Ramsay* and *Hussey*.

   Guha is in the same field of database management and retrieval of images and/or document as *Abdel-Mottaleb* and *Hussey*.

   It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include filename, information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored, as part of or the entirety of the search result whereas the motivation would've been to allow the user to browsed efficiently and retrieve requested document and/or images quickly (***Guha,* Col 1, Rows 23-25, "rapidly identify whether or not a particular item exists"**).

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Ramsay et al. (US 5502576 A)* in view of *Hussey (US 5826269 A)* and *Guha (US 6539373 B1)* and further in view of *Seder et al. (US 2002/0164053 A1)*.

    Regarding Claim 3, *Ramsay* discloses wherein said searching device comprises a watermarked information-sensing device **(Column 8, Rows 35 through 50. This is the background introduction known to one ordinarily skilled in the art. It speaks of using 8-bit grayscale for document processing to "assure far greater certainty when verifying the integrity and authenticity of the electronic image" wherein 8-bit grayscale image contains background details such as watermark to verify and authenticate a document when a searching device attempts to locate a document in the server, Column 8, Rows 39 through 43. Therefore,** *Ramsay* **implicitly teaches that the electronic image format disclosed in the embodiment contains details such as watermark).**

    While the disclosure does not explicitly teach that the Mass Storage 34 has a search device that senses watermark, but by disclosing that it is preferred to use 8 bit grayscale electronic image format that contains details such as watermark for the goal of document authentication and verification, it enables one ordinarily skilled in the art to incorporate watermark sensor into the searching device of Mass Storage 34.

    Furthermore, in Paragraph [0029] of *Seder*, it is disclose an optical sensor with decoder software that reads document identifier from watermark payloads and uses that to retrieve the document.

    Therefore, it would've been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to adapt the sensor of Mass Storage 34 of *Ramsay* with the watermark sensing capability of *Seder* in

order to properly retrieve the needed image document whereas the motivation to combine can be located in *Ramsay* (**Column 8, Rows 40 through 44**) "assure far greater certainty when verifying the integrity and authenticity of electronic images.....".

8.   Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teaching of *Ramsay et al. (US 5502576 A)* in view of *Hussey (US 5826269 A)* and *Guha (US 6539373 B1)* and further in view of *Cullen et al. (US 5893908 A)*.

The primary reference, *Ramsay* teaches the subject matters of Claim 1 from which Claims 2 and 8 are dependent upon.

However, *Ramsay* does not teach that the search device uses optical character recognition for document retrieval of Claim 2, and correspondence information indicative of priorities assigned according to degrees of correspondence of Claim 8.

Regarding Claim 2, *Cullen* teaches wherein said searching device comprises a character recognition device (**Col 7, Rows 12-37. In particular, Rows 30-37**).

Therefore, it would've been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the search device of *Ramsay* with the additional capability of character recognition of *Cullen* in order to provide "an electronic document management system may provide automatic archiving of documents and retrieval without the need to navigate through a directory structure or specify a filename." (***Cullen*, Col 1, Row 64 - Col 2, Row 6**).

Regarding Claim 8, *Cullen* teaches wherein in a case where a plurality of original electronic document files corresponding to the electronic document data within the output image information are searched out, the result of search includes correspondence information indicative of priorities assigned to the plurality of original electronic document files

according to degrees of correspondence **(Col 5, Rows 27-50. The system lists the search results in descending order where the document with the most descriptors matching the user's document of interest is at the top)**.

Therefore, it would've been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to adapt the method of listing search results base on matching descriptors as suggested by ***Cullen*** to the system of ***Ramsay*** in order to have "an electronic document management system that takes advantage of advanced document analysis techniques" (***Cullen,*** **Col 1, Rows 64-65**) to facilitate the process of identifying the correct document being desire.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

    should be directed to examiner Richard Z. Zhu whose telephone number is 571-270-1587 or

    examiner's supervisor King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. Examiner

    Richard Zhu can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 6:30 - 5:00.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

    Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

    applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

    for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

    about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access

    to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

    (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or

    access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or

    571-272-1000.

RZ[2]   Richard Z. Zhu
02/05/2008   Assistant Examiner
                                                       Art Unit 2625

/King Y. Poon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625